

**Chapter 13****PHYSICAL AND CULTURAL GENOCIDE OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES****Robert K. Hitchcock****Tara M. Twedt****Introduction**

The indigenous peoples in the world today have been described as "victims of progress" (Bodley, 1999) and who as a people have had to face "colonization, genocide, and a constant struggle for cultural and physical survival" (Independent Commission on International Humanitarian Issues, 1987, p. xi). Indigenous peoples are small-scale -- and sometimes large-scale -- societies that frequently have been dealt with harshly by the governments and citizens in the states in which they live. Some see them as being particularly vulnerable to genocidal acts because of their small group sizes, cultural distinctiveness, occupation of remote areas, and relative technological and organizational simplicity (Kuper, 1985, p. 301; Burger, 1987, p. 38; Amnesty International, 1992a, pp. 61-62).

Variously referred to as aboriginals, native peoples, tribal peoples, Fourth World peoples, or "first nations," these populations have suffered from vicious mistreatment, discrimination, and lack of equal opportunity in employment for centuries. This was especially true from the time of colonial expansion into Africa, Asia, the Pacific, and the

Americas (International Labour Office, 1953; Wolf, 1982; Wilmer, 1993; Heinz, 1988; Howard, 2003). As Burger (1987) notes, "When the indigenous population did not encounter direct genocide, they faced instead enslavement, forced labor, and menial work" (p. 38). Over the past 500 years, literally millions of indigenous peoples have had to cope with destruction of their life ways and habitats, disease, dispossession, and exploitation (Clay, 1984; Maybury Lewis 1997, 2002; International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs 1988; Hitchcock, 1999; Hitchcock and Koperski, 2008).

Substantial numbers of indigenous peoples have been the victims of gross violations of human rights. These violations have ranged from extrajudicial executions of individuals and torture to intentional starvation and from large-scale massacres of entire groups to, as previously mentioned, genocide. According to the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (1988), a conservative estimate of the annual deaths of indigenous peoples by violent means in the 1980s was around 30,000 (p. 1). In 2006, indigenous peoples continued to face threats in numerous countries. In the Philippines, for example, at least 26 indigenous rights activists were killed in government crackdowns on members of opposition groups (Stidsen, 2007a, p. 11). There were also killings of indigenous people in numerous other countries, including Bangladesh, Brazil, India, Indonesia, Kenya, and Russia (Stidsen, 2007b).

In many cases worldwide, these deaths are attributable directly to state actions and to the unwillingness of non-indigenous agencies and individuals to assess the impacts of their policies on indigenous societies. A critical problem is that although international human rights standards pertaining to indigenous peoples exist, these standards frequently are ignored at the local, national, and international levels.

Several major factors have been responsible for the threats to the lives and well being of indigenous peoples in the twentieth and early twenty first centuries. The first is competition for resources both on the part of states and transnational corporations (Gedicks, 1993, 2001; Hitchcock, 1994, 1997). The second factor is that a number of indigenous groups have sought self-determination in the face of efforts on the part of governments to assimilate them. The third factor is the opposition on the part of some indigenous groups to the plans and policies of political elites and development agencies. A major concern of indigenous peoples in 2007 was the tendency of governments to criminalize indigenous groups, designating some of them as terrorists. The "war on terrorism" which intensified after the events of September 11, 2001, has seen indigenous and minority groups around the world exposed to greater risk and increased human rights violations (Minority Rights Group, 2007; Stidsen, 2007b).

Genocides of indigenous peoples occur, as Kuper (1985) notes "in the process of struggles by ethnic or racial or religious groups for power or secession, greater autonomy, or more equality" (p. 155). Many indigenous groups have suffered from the depredations of governments, private companies, and individuals bent on taking their land and resources -- forcibly or through quasilegal means such as treaties and agreements (DeLoria, 1969, 1985; Burger, 1987, 1990; Durning, 1992, pp. 21-23; Amnesty International, 1992a, pp. 34-41; Hitchcock, 1994; Bodley, 1999; Wishart, 2001).

Indigenous populations frequently have been denied the right to practice their own religions and customs and/or to speak their own languages by nation-states, a process described as "cultural genocide" or "ethnocide" (Kuper, 1981, pp.31, 41; Burger, 1987, p. 31; Heinz, 1988, p.75; and, Chalk and Jonnasohn, 1990, pp. 9, 23). For purposes

of this chapter, ethnocide will be distinguished from genocide as it refers to the destruction of cultures rather than people per se. Ethnocide ultimately may have a significant impact on the well-being of indigenous societies since it sometimes results in people becoming so dispirited as to lack the desire to survive.

This chapter, then, centers on issues relating to the physical and cultural genocide of various indigenous peoples. We deal first with the question of the characteristics of indigenous peoples. Next, we focus on the issue of the definition of genocide as it relates to indigenous populations, and we examine the various indigenous peoples as victim groups. We follow with a discussion of the contexts in which genocides of indigenous groups occur, and we conclude with some recommendations for ways to protect indigenous peoples from the horrors of genocide.

### **Who Are Indigenous Peoples?**

No single agree-upon definition of the term "indigenous peoples" exists. According to the Independent Commission on International Humanitarian Issues (1987), four elements are included in the definition: (1) pre-existence, (2) non-dominance, (3) cultural difference, and (4) self-identification as indigenous (p. 6). The term "indigenous peoples" is usually used in reference to those individuals and groups who are descendants of the original populations residing in a country. In the majority of cases they are ethnic minorities. In some cases, the term "indigenous" sometimes applies to non-European groups residing in regions that were colonized by Europeans. The term "indigenous

peoples” is also used to apply to local populations who lived in a place before a state system incorporated them (Perry, 1996, p. 8).

There are different approaches among analysts to the issue of terminology regarding indigenous peoples. The International Labour Organization (1953) uses the phrase "tribal and indigenous peoples" (pp. 3-5), while the World Bank and the United Nations prefer "indigenous peoples" (Swepston, 1989, p. 260; Martinez Cobo, 1987; World Bank, 2005a). As the World Bank's (2005a) Operational Directive 4-10 on Indigenous Peoples notes, no single definition is appropriate to cover the diversity present in these populations (p.1).

Indigenous peoples generally possess ethnic, economic, religious, or linguistic characteristics that are different from the dominant groups in the societies where they exist. In many cases, they tend to have a strong sense of cultural identity and social solidarity, which many group members attempt to maintain (Niezen, 2003). Most indigenous peoples prefer to reserve for themselves the right to determine who are and are not members of their groups (Ewen, 1994; Anaya, 1996; Perry, 1996).

Nearly forty percent of the world's countries (72 of 191) contain peoples defined as indigenous. Estimates of the numbers of indigenous peoples vary widely, but generally range between 350,000,000 and 700,000,000 (Soefestad, 1995; Maybury Lewis 1997; Stidsen, 2007a, p. 10). Together, indigenous peoples comprise about 6-10 percent of the world's total population, depending on the way figures are calculated (Hitchcock and Koperski, 2008). Table 1 contains an estimate of the numbers of indigenous peoples around the world. Some of these groups live on borders and as such are essentially transboundary in nature, which is seen as a threat by some states concerned with

[Table 1 goes about here]

border security. The approximately 100,000 San, for example, are found in six countries of southern Africa (Angola, Botswana, Namibia, South Africa, Zambia, and Zimbabwe) (Suzman, 2001a), while the 60,000-100,000 Saami are found in Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Russia (Lehtola, 2004). Indigenous peoples usually are minorities, but in some states they make up majority of the population, as is the case in Papua New Guinea (87 percent); Bolivia (77 percent); and Guatemala (55 percent). Indigenous peoples represent some 10 percent of Latin America's population and are the largest disadvantaged group on the continent.

Particular problems arise in defining people as indigenous in Africa and Asia. In many parts of Africa it is difficult to antecede since a variety of populations have moved in and out of local areas over time. Most African countries are multiethnic entities that contain a sizable number of different societies. Nigeria, for example, has at least 500 ethnic groups within its borders (Gordon, 2005). However, African governments are reluctant to disclose what percentage of their population is indigenous, taking the position, as Botswana has, that all the people in the country (with the exceptions of Europeans and Asians) are indigenous (see the Botswana government website, [www.gov.bw](http://www.gov.bw)). Individual Africans, on the other hand, frequently identify themselves as members of specific tribal or ethnic groups, which they tend to see as indigenous.

Even if some people claim to be indigenous, the countries where they live may not recognize them as aboriginal. The government of India, for example, maintains on the

one hand that no indigenous groups exist within the country, but, on the other hand, the Indian government designates tens of millions of its citizens as "tribals" (Adivasis, "Scheduled Tribes" (Bhengra, Bijoy, and Luthui, 1998).

African and Asian countries tend to take one of two different positions on the issue of indigenous populations: (1) they claim that there are no indigenous peoples whatsoever within their boundaries, or (2) they state that all groups in the country are indigenous (Martinez Cobo, 1987, p. 5; Sanders, 1989, pp. 417-418). Some countries, such as Botswana, prefer not to differentiate specific groups as targets of assistance, in part because they do not wish to be seen as practicing a kind of apartheid or separation on the basis of ethnic identification, as was seen in neighboring South Africa until 1994 (Saugestad, 2001; Hitchcock, 2002). On the other hand, there are states that do not want to admit to having indigenous peoples, in part because they do not want to have to respond to queries or submit to investigations by the United Nations, the International Labour Organization, and other agencies on behalf of indigenous peoples. Some of them, such as Kenya, Tanzania, and the United States also do not want to meet new demands of indigenous populations for compensation for losses of land or natural resources.

Indigenous peoples are united in their desire to maintain their identities and to seek better standards of living and fair treatment. In some cases, these desires have led to efforts on their part to resist the attempts of states or other groups to change them. Some ethnic groups have been successful in their attempts to seek self-determination and sovereignty, as seen, for example, in the case of the people of East Timor, which became the world's newest nation on 31 August, 2007.

While there is tremendous diversity among the world's indigenous peoples, they tend to have a number of socioeconomic features in common. Many indigenous peoples have strong ties to the land and its resources. Their economies are sometimes subsistence oriented, producing goods for domestic use, although many of them do engage in market activities and raise cash through sales of goods and services. Some indigenous peoples derive a fairly significant portion of their diet and material requirements from hunting and gathering. Others are pastoralists (herders) who graze their domestic animals in savannas, deserts, temperate zones, and mountain environments. The vast majority of indigenous peoples are farmers who not only raise crops but also engage in various off-farm activities and rural and urban wage sector employment. Although many of these groups occupy remote areas, they are not isolated.

Some analysts suggest that contemporary indigenous groups are among the world's most disadvantaged populations (Heinz, 1988; Maybury Lewis, 1997, 2002; Bodley, 1999). A large percentage of the world's indigenous people live below the poverty line. In Namibia, for example, sixty percent of the San were below the poverty datum line (Suzman, 2001, p. 8) while 95 percent of the Batek of Malaysia have incomes below \$200 per year (Kirk Endicott, personal communication, 2007). Infant mortality rates among them tend to be high while health and nutritional standards generally are low. Unemployment rates are high, with some American Indian groups experiencing a 50 to 70 unemployment rate.

Many members of indigenous groups do not own land, and most groups have experienced dispossession or reductions in their ancestral territories. Educational and literacy levels generally are low, and languages are disappearing at a rapid rate, in part



because of government policies aimed at acculturation and teaching of national languages (Nettle and Romaine, 2000; Skuttnab-Kangas, 2000). At the same time, some indigenous peoples and their supporters such as the Lacandon Maya of Chiapas and Ju/'hoansi San in Namibia have started schools with curricula geared to their specific needs (Hays, 2007; Jill Gnade, personal communication).

Racism is a fact of life for indigenous peoples throughout the world. They are usually at the bottom of the socioeconomic scale of the countries where they live, and they are marginalized politically and legally. Indigenous groups have had difficulty getting redress for crimes committed against them, and they have often been treated negatively by courts when they have been charged with illegal activities. Often, the sentences they receive are more severe than those meted out to non-indigenous individuals (Amnesty International, 1992b). Members of indigenous communities tend to be overrepresented in the prisons of states such as Australia, Canada, and Botswana. Sometimes charges against indigenous groups are trumped up in order to remove them from lands that others covet, as was the case with the Triqui Indians in Mexico in 1984-1985 and with the Penan in Malaysia in 1988-1989 (see [www.survival.org](http://www.survival.org)). Many indigenous leaders argue that they have had to pay a terrible price for their interaction with non-indigenous societies.

### **Genocides among Indigenous Peoples**

Many researchers, human rights workers, and journalists deem the ways in which indigenous peoples have been dealt with in the twentieth century to be genocide (Lewis,

1969, 1974, 1976; Munzel, 1973, 1974, 1985; Arens, 1976, 1978; Clay, 1984; Barta, 1987; Legters, 1988; Tatz, 1991, 2003; Hitchcock, 1999; Jaimes, 1992; Totten, Parsons, and Hitchcock, 2002; Barkan, 2003; Daes, 2005; Rensink, 2006). It is clear from a critical review of the literature on indigenous peoples that most writers use a fairly broad definition of the concept of genocide. While some researchers see genocide as a set of acts committed with the intent to destroy groups in whole or in part, as defined by the United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, others extend the concept to include such actions as intentional prevention of ethnic groups from practicing their traditional customs; forced resettlement; denial of access to food relief, health assistance, and development funds; and destruction of the habitats utilized by indigenous populations.

Sometimes victim groups label actions against them as genocidal in order to seek public recognition of the problems they are facing or to bring about greater condemnation of the actions of perpetrators. Defining genocide too narrowly, on the other hand, could have the effect of allowing authorities to overlook actions that are destructive and which eventually could result in the extinction of indigenous populations. As Totten, Parsons, and Hitchcock (2002) point out, if we are to develop sound conventions and warning systems to prevent genocide from occurring, then we need to have a comprehensive understanding of what does and does not constitute genocide (pp. 76-78).

Genocide, in the eyes of a number of social scientists, is the deliberate and systematic destruction of a racial, political, social, religious, or cultural group by the state (Chalk and Jonassohn, 1990; Horowitz, 2002; Gellately and Kiernan, 2003). One problem with this approach, however, is that it may not cover those acts that are

committed by settlers and miners in the Amazon, or private companies involved in the implementation of development projects. Clearly, in order to cover the diversity existing in cases of annihilation of indigenous peoples, it is necessary to use a definition that incorporates the full array of target groups and perpetrators and which specifies intent.

Fein (1990) defines genocide as "sustained purposeful action by a perpetrator to physically destroy a collectivity social reproduction of group members, sustained regardless of the surrender or lack of threat offered by the victim" (p 24). This definition is useful in that it excludes single massacres and is aimed at physically destroying group members selected on the basis of their being part of a collectivity. At the same time, it does not specify whether the actions of the perpetrator were authorized specifically by the state.

It is important to note that genocide is by no means a simple or unified phenomenon. Genocide represents systematic efforts to destroy collectivities, many of which are minorities. Cases of physical genocide include those in which the killing of members of a collectivity threatens the survival of the group as a whole. In practice, however, genocidal acts usually do not result in total annihilation of the population. Groups that have been subjected to genocidal treatment often end up being victimized in other ways as well; they are sometimes raped, enslaved, deprived of their property, and forcibly removed to new places. Some groups have died out as a result of indirect impacts genocide, including starvation and disease.

Chalk and Jonassohn (1990) use the term "genocidal massacre" in reference to those cases in which a combination of genocide and ethnocide was employed (p. 26). In these instances, "There is no intent to kill the entire victim group, but its disappearance is

intended" (Chalk and Jonassohn, 1990, p. 26). The distinction between physical and cultural genocide is by no means clear-cut. According to Chalk and Jonassohn (1990) assimilation policies on the part of the United States, combined with differential legal treatment of Indians, had major impacts on the well being of Native Americans (pp. 195-203). In the Americas, Australia, South Africa, and other settler societies, most indigenous peoples suffered and died from disease, starvation, and related physical and cultural stresses (Wolf, 1982; Barta, 1987; Bodley, 1999, pp. 38-41, 78-93; Tatz, 1991, 2003; Brantlinger, 2003; Daes, 2005).

While the U.S. government generally did not openly espouse extermination policies, it did engage throughout its history in cultural modification programs that led to the destruction of Indian societies. It is not surprising, therefore, that American Indian writers tend to describe American government policy as genocidal in intent (see, for example, DeLoria, 1969, 1985). Most non-Native Americans would reject the suggestion that they are part of a genocidal society (for a discussion of this concept, see Barta, 1987, pp. 237-240). The fact is, though, that while the U.S. government employed ethnocide as its major indigenous peoples' policy, it was always ready to resort to genocide if it was deemed desirable (DeLoria, 1969, 1985; Legters, 1988; Chalk and Jonassohn, 1990, p. 203; Jaimes, 1992).. Examples of genocidal actions against Native American populations include the massacre of Cheyenne and Arapaho at Sand Creek in eastern Colorado in November, 1864 (Hoig, 1961; Carroll, 1973; Rensink, 2006), the killings of over 200 Minnecojou and Hunkpapa Sioux at Wounded Knee in December, 1890 and the systematic extrajudicial killings of dozens of Oglala Lakota in and around the Pine Ridge

Reservation in South Dakota in the 1970s (Weyler, 1982; Matthiessen, 1983; Crow Dog and Erdoes, 1990, pp. 115-116).

Forced relocation, education of Native American children in Euro-American concepts rather than Native American ones, destruction of the subsistence economies of indigenous groups, and imposition of new forms of sociopolitical organization all were implemented by American governmental agencies (Thornton, 1987). It was not until 1924 that Native Americans even received U.S. citizenship rights, and it was another decade before the government lifted its ban on Native Americans' practice of traditional religious activities (Amnesty International, 1992a, p.7). Native Americans in America today are still seeking religious freedoms, which have been compromised by a series of court decisions.

Cultural genocide takes place under conditions of state imposition of educational programs, modernization efforts, and nation building. Throughout the world, indigenous peoples have been coerced or cajoled into giving up their cultural traditions. Sometimes this is done in the name of "national reconciliation" after decolonization. States as diverse as Turkey, Somalia, and Russia have required their citizens to learn national languages. Even countries with positive human rights records, such as Botswana, have implemented national educational systems that fail to instruct indigenous students in their own customs and languages (Bieseke and Hitchcock, 2000).

Ethnocide also occurs in situations where non-native religious organizations promote their views and seek actively to discourage the practice of indigenous traditions (Palmer, 1992). It is important to note, however, that although ethnocidal policies are practiced widely, they have not led invariably to cultural disintegration. A cultural

resurgence or a kind of ethnogenesis process is occurring among sizable numbers of indigenous peoples in many parts of the world (Burger, 1990; Durning, 1992, pp. 37-46; Bodley, 1999, pp. 145-169; Reed, 2003; Jackson and Warren, 2005; Stidsen, 2007b).

Genocides of indigenous peoples in the twentieth century have occurred in a number of different contexts, ranging from those where there is competition over resources and land to multiethnic settings with socioeconomic stratification and cleavages among the various groups. In the past, a significant proportion of the genocides of indigenous peoples occurred during the course of colonial expansion, a process seen in the twentieth century primarily in the movements of settlers, companies, and government agencies into frontier zones. The expansion of miners and settlers into the interior of Brazil, for example, led to the destruction of a number of groups, some of whom were killed by Indian agents of the government's Indian protection agency (Davis, 1977; Price, 1989). An invasion of Yanomami land by miners, with the apparent complicity of the government and the army, resulted in killings and environmental devastation (American Anthropological Association, 1991; Albert, 1992, 1994; Chagnon 1993a-c; Sponsel, 1994, 1997). Indian agents, settlers, and miners have also been responsible for both purposeful and accidental introduction of diseases, which had a terrible impact on tribal populations.

"Indigenous peoples are killed simply for who they are," according to Maya human rights activist and anthropologist Victor Montejo (n.d., p. 2). Indigenous peoples increasingly are protesting the human rights abuses they suffer at the hands of governments, development agencies, and multinational corporations. They note that they face many forms of persecution. Organized political killings and "disappearances" of

indigenous leaders and members of opposition groups are common in countries such as Guatemala and Peru (Menchu, 1983; Carmack, 1988; Manz, 1988; Warren, 1998; Stoll, 1999; Sanford, 2003; Jackson and Warren, 2005). In South and Southeast Asia, the Amazon Basin, the Middle East, Africa, and the Pacific, entire communities of indigenous peoples have been massacred (Anti-Slavery Society, 1984; Burger, 1987; Gurr and Scaritt, 1989; Tatz, 1991; Maybury Lewis, 1997; Daes, 2005; Stidsen, 2007b; Hitchcock and Koperski, 2008; Survival International, [www.survival-international.org](http://www.survival-international.org)).

In Brazil, more than eighty Indian tribes that came in contact with the national society were destroyed between 1900 and 1957, and as a result the indigenous population dropped from approximately a million to less than 200,000 (Davis, 1977, p. 5).

As far back as 1984, Clay noted that “There probably have been more genocides, ethnocides, and extinctions of tribal and ethnic groups in this century than any in history” (p. 1). From the standpoint of indigenous peoples’ survival, the twentieth century was brutal.

Indigenous peoples have been the victims of genocidal and ethnocidal acts in part because of the ways in which they have been represented by dominant societies. In many cases, members of indigenous communities have been described as primitives,” “subhuman,” “savages,” “vermin,” or “nuisances.” In fact, they have been subjected to these and other negative stereotypes for generations. The images of indigenous peoples have reinforced the tendencies on the part of governments to establish destructive and oppressive racial policies. Efforts on the part of states to vilify indigenous groups are frequently preconditions for genocidal action. This is especially true in those situations where nation-states are concerned about the possibility of indigenous groups supporting

opposition movements, as was the case, for example, in Guatemala (Menchu, 1983; Montejo, 1987, Carmack, 1988; Manz, 1988; Stoll, 1999; Wilkinson, 2002; Sanford, 2003).

It is extremely difficult to obtain reliable information on genocidal actions and/or outright genocides of indigenous peoples. There are several reasons for this. First, most contemporary indigenous groups that are victimized tend to be located in remote places or in conflict zones where it is difficult to gain access. Second, most governments and agencies that come in contact with indigenous groups tend to downplay or deny the severity of their treatment of those peoples. Third, some of the indigenous groups that have been the victims of genocidal acts have members who do not read or write; consequently, written records of what happened to them are rare. Fourth, while members of indigenous groups speak their own languages, they do not necessarily speak national languages that people doing interviews tend to speak; the result is that translation becomes something of a problem. Not surprisingly, there are relatively few first-person accounts of genocide of various indigenous peoples (Totten, 1991, pp. 311-319).

In the twentieth century, indigenous groups disappeared at an unprecedented rate (Clay, 1984, p. 1; Durning, 1992, p. 9). This loss of cultural diversity was a product of both physical and cultural extinction. Table 2 contains a summary of twentieth-century and early twenty first century cases of physical genocide of various indigenous peoples.

[Table 2 goes about here]



The reports from which the data are drawn include the *Urgent Action Bulletins* (UAB) of the indigenous peoples' advocacy organization Survival International, reports by other non-government organizations, published sources, and personal communications. It is evident from the data presented here that a variety of indigenous peoples in a number of different countries were the victims of genocidal actions. Indigenous hunter-gatherers, who Kuper (1981) saw as victimized groups that are perpetually at risk, have been particularly hard hit (p. 158). The treatment of foraging societies is extremely difficult to monitor, in part because they tend to be mobile and in a number of cases avoid contact with outsiders (Hitchcock, Totten, and Parsons, 2002; Castillo, 2004). Because of the tendency of hunter-gatherers to have fewer links with the larger society and their small numbers, the plight of these groups often goes unnoticed (Kuper, 1981, p. 158; Kuper, 1985, pp. 201-202; Hitchcock, 1985, pp. 457-459).

Some indigenous groups have been deemed, by the governments of the states in which they live, as terrorists or as being involved in liberation movements, an argument that is sometimes used by nation-states to justify genocidal actions. In the Philippines, for example, members of indigenous groups on Mindanao and Luzon have been attacked because of alleged support for liberation groups, and Adivasis have been discriminated against, attacked killed in India due to their being considered primitives, uncivilized, and subhuman (Stidsen, 2007b, pp. 314-320, 398-406).

It is important to note that warfare undertaken to exterminate an enemy can be (and has been) carried out by indigenous groups, although it is much less common among indigenous and tribal peoples (Krech, 1994, p. 14, Douglas Bamforth, Raymond Hames,

personal communications). Examples in the 20th century include the Bay region of Somalia in the early 1990s and the Democratic Republic of Congo in the latter part of the 1990s. There is archaeological evidence that indicates the destruction of entire groups of indigenous peoples by other indigenous groups (Willey, 1990; Krech, 2002, pp. 14-15).

### **Typologies of Genocide Relating to Indigenous Peoples**

Researchers have developed numerous typologies of genocide that include categories relevant to indigenous peoples as victim groups (Dadrian, 1975; Kuper, 1981, pp. 46-54, 88, 158; Kuper, 1984, pp. 32-33; Kuper, 1985, pp. 151, 200-202, 211-212; Smith, 1987, pp. 23-25, 30-32; Chalk and Jonassohn, 1990, pp. 22-29, 195-222, 412-414; Fein, 1990, pp. 28-30, 79-91). Of the five categories of genocide identified by Dadrian (1975), one of them, which he calls *utilitarian genocide*, aims at obtaining control of economic resources. Examples of this kind of genocide against indigenous groups include the Ache of Paraguay and the Indians of Brazil.

Smith (1987) sees genocide as an aspect of (1) war, and (2) development, and he notes that in the past genocide appeared in a variety of contexts, including conquest, religious persecution, and colonial domination. He distinguishes five different types of genocide, one of which, like Dadrian (1975), he calls *utilitarian genocide* {Smith, 1987, pp. 23-25). This kind of genocide, according to Smith (1987), occurred especially in the sixteenth- to nineteenth-century period when colonial societies came in contact with

indigenous peoples in the Americas, Australia, Tasmania, and Africa (p. 23). It has continued in the twentieth century as the Indians of Paraguay, Brazil, and Peru have been destroyed, as Smith (1987) puts it, "out of cold calculation of gain, and, in some cases, as sadistic pleasure" (p. 23). The basic objectives of twentieth century genocides of indigenous peoples have been, according to Smith (1987), Indian land and resources and labor (p. 25).

Like some other analysts of genocide, Smith (1987) rejects the hypotheses of population surplus and political crisis as being primary causes of the destruction of indigenous peoples, arguing instead that "They are being killed because of a combination of ethnocentrism and simple greed" (p. 25). He goes on to suggest that the basic motivation behind utilitarian genocide is that some people, according to the perpetrators' world view, must die "so that others might live well" (Smith, 1987, p. 25). Smith adds that one of the reasons that this kind of genocide claims fewer lives today than in the past is because earlier genocides were so effective and contemporary indigenous populations are so small (Smith, 1987, p. 25). In Smith's view, genocidal actions against indigenous peoples are not simply accidental or unpremeditated events but are acts perpetrated purposely to achieve economic objectives.

Chalk and Jonassohn (1990) classify genocides according to the motives behind them (p. 29). They distinguish four types of genocide that set out to accomplish various goals: (1) to eliminate a real or potential threat, (2) to spread terror among real or potential enemies, (3) to acquire economic wealth, and (4) to implement a belief, theory, or ideology. The genocide most relevant to indigenous peoples is that aimed at acquiring economic wealth. That said, genocides also occur in order to terrorize indigenous

peoples into subservience (Chalk and Jonassohn, 1990, pp. 29, 36-37). Substantial numbers of killings and deaths of indigenous peoples due to disease and starvation occurred in the context of European expansion into the Americas, Africa, Asia, and the Pacific and were a result of campaigns by frontier settlers (Thornton, 1987). Sometimes these actions were opposed by governments, but, as Chalk and Jonassohn (1990) note, efforts to protect indigenous peoples were feeble at best (pp. 36-37).

An equivalent category to the utilitarian genocide suggested by Dadrian (1975) and Smith (1987) and that of genocide aimed at acquiring economic wealth suggested by Chalk and Jonassohn (1990) is what Fein (1984) refers to as developmental genocide (pp. 8-9). This type of genocide generally is preceded by the movement of development agencies, governmental organizations, or individuals into frontier zones where indigenous groups reside and make their living. There is, of course, significant variation in the ways in which encroaching individuals and agencies have dealt with local peoples. In some cases the outsiders have attempted to negotiate with local people; in other cases, they have taken their land and resources away from them without their permission; and in still other cases they have tried to annihilate them (Fein, 1984, p. 8; Bodley, 1999, pp. 12-92).

Harff (1984) and Gurr and Harff (1992), on the other hand, differentiate between genocides and politicides, the former referring to extreme repression aimed at destroying groups defined on the basis of their membership in particular ethnic, religious, national, or racial groups, and the latter referring to victims defined in terms of their political position (e.g., classes or political organizations opposed to the state or dominant group).

Politicides, they contend, are more numerous and just as deadly as genocides (Gurr and Harff, 1992, p. 169).

Worldwide, a number of indigenous peoples are caught up in conflicts between governments and local insurgent organizations. In South America, Asia, the Pacific, and Africa, many of the instances of genocide of indigenous peoples have occurred in the context of armed conflicts in which either the government forces or the opposition groups or both have targeted local people for their support of one side or the other or solely for being in the region where military actions occur. In some cases, as in the Ituri Forest region of the Democratic Republic of Congo, indigenous peoples, in this case the Mbuti Pygmies, were targeted by groups involved in fighting in the region (Bergner, 2003; Human Rights Watch, 2003a).

It is possible to distinguish specific types of genocide involving indigenous populations. The first type, which can be termed *socioeconomic genocide*, comes about in the context of colonization or exploitation of resources in areas occupied by indigenous groups (this can also be described as *developmental genocide*). The perpetrators of socioeconomic genocides range from government organizations established ostensibly to assist indigenous peoples to settlers who receive subsidies from the state and from large landowners to peasant farmers. Multilateral development banks such as the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank have been responsible for the destruction of indigenous populations through funding projects in the Chittagong Hills of Bangladesh (Anti-Slavery Society, 1984; Mey, 1984; Chittagong Hill Tracts Commission, 1991), the Chixoy Dam area of Guatemala (Johnston, 2005, 2006), and the islands of Sumatra, East Timor, Sulawesi, and Kalimantan of Indonesia where the Transmigration Program, a

large-scale resettlement effort, was implemented (Burger, 1987, pp. 142-147; Bodley, 1999, p. 91; Gedicks, 2001). Survival International, Environmental Defense, the Sierra Club, the Natural Resources Defense Council, and other non-government organizations have attacked the World Bank for what they perceived as the Bank's failure to undertake comprehensive social and environmental impact assessments and to implement adequate compensation and resettlement programs (see, for example, Survival International, 2000). It should be noted, however, that the World Bank has made efforts to improve its policies regarding indigenous peoples. Between 1992 and 2005 the World Bank financed 449 projects involving indigenous peoples, and it had put in place a set of standards and regulations regarding the treatment and participation of indigenous peoples in project activities (World Bank, 2005a, b; Dan Aronson, personal communication, 2007).

A second type of genocide where indigenous peoples are victims is *retributive genocide*, in which actions are taken against collectivities that are perceived as threats or as representing opposition to state ideology and interests. This kind of genocide occurs in contexts in which (1) there is civil conflict, or (2) there are challenges to the legitimacy and authority of a dominant class or group. Indigenous peoples in a number of countries have been the victims of retributive genocide in the twentieth century, including the Hereros and San of Namibia, the Maya of Guatemala and Mexico, the Nuba of Sudan, the Kurds of Iraq, the Nagas of India, and various groups in Malaysia, Indonesia, and the Philippines (Gurr, 2000; Minority Rights Group International, 2007; Stidsen, 2007b; Gordon, n.d.). Data on these and other cases have been provided by governments and non-government organizations, opposition groups, anthropologists, and indigenous people themselves. This information has sometimes resulted in further investigations into

the treatment of indigenous groups (see, for example, American Anthropological Association, 1991; Chittagong Hill Tracts Commission, 1991). The problem, however, is that the findings of these investigations have not always led to improvements in the situations facing indigenous populations.

It is useful, as Kuper (1984) points out, to draw a distinction between "domestic" genocides, those arising from international divisions within a society, and genocides resulting from international warfare (p. 32). The majority of the genocides perpetrated against indigenous peoples fall into the category of domestic genocides. Chalk and Jonassohn (1990) suggest that it is often new states or regimes that try to impose ideological conformity that are especially likely to commit genocide (p. 18). Fein (1984) points out that the structural relationships most conducive to genocide are ones based in ethnic stratification in which state power is not constrained effectively by internal or external checks (p. 6). The victims of genocide are often those who are not fully incorporated into the state system, middleman minorities, or opposition groups, as shown, for example, in the results of the work in the Minorities at Risk Study of the Center for International Development and Conflict Management at the University of Maryland (Gurr, 2000). In Africa, indigenous peoples have been subjected to genocidal and ethnocidal treatment in a number of states in the late twentieth and early twenty first centuries (see Table 3). A

[Table 3 goes about here]

recent case of genocide in Africa is the on-going in the Darfur region of western Sudan, where Fur, Zaghawa, Masalit, and other African groups have been subjected to mass murder, rape, aerial and ground attacks, destruction of villages, crops, and livestock, ethnic cleansing, and efforts to prevent the distribution of food, medicines, and other relief supplies (See Samuel Totten's chapter, "The Darfur Genocide," in this volume for a detailed discussion of that particular genocide.)

Secretary of State Colin Powell and the U.S. House of Representatives declared the events in Darfur as constituting genocide in June, 2004. United Nations Security Council Resolution 1593 referred the situation in Darfur to the International Criminal Court (ICC). Currently, there is an African Union (AU) peace-keeping force in Sudan, but it is under-funded and under-equipped. A number of international organizations are monitoring the situation in western Sudan, including the International Crisis Group, Human Rights Watch, and Amnesty International. Nevertheless, the killings, ethnic cleansing, rapes, and destruction of communities continue unabated as the government of Sudan continues to maintain that the situation in Darfur is an internal matter.

*Ecocide*, the purposeful and systematic destruction of ecosystems by states, agencies, or corporations, is a problem that many indigenous peoples in various parts of the world have also faced. For example, the Ogoni and other indigenous and minority groups in the Niger Delta of Nigeria have claimed that the government of Nigeria and transnational corporations including Shell and ExxonMobil have been complicit in allowing oil spills and the dumping and burning of toxic substances (Sachs, 1995, 1996). Similar claims have been made about the actions of the Brazilian and Venezuelan governments and the gold miners (*garimpos*) who use mercury in gold processing in the area occupied by the



Yanomamo in northern Brazil and southern Venezuela (Sponsel, 1994). The former government of Iraq under Saddam Hussein had also been accused of ecocidal actions in the destruction of the marshes of southern Iraq and attacks on the Marsh Arabs (Mada'in) and other groups in the period following the Gulf War of 1991 (Human Rights Watch, 1992; Partow, 2001). The Iraqi's drained the marshes in retaliation for the Marsh Arabs' rebellion against Saddam Hussein during the Gulf War. Turkey and Syria contributed to the draining of the marshlands as well by holding water back from the rivers entering Iraq. As Human Rights Watch (2003b) reported: Prior to their destruction, the marshlands (*al-ahwar*) had covered an area of up to 20,000 square kilometers around the confluence of the Tigris and Euphrates rivers in southern Iraq.... Together, these wetlands formed a series of interconnected permanent marshes and lakes covering an area of some 8,800 square kilometers, extending to some 20,000 kilometers when large tracts of dry or desert land were seasonally inundated. The marshlands were once home to several hundred thousand inhabitants, the Ma'dan, a people whose unique way of life had been preserved for over 5,000 years (p. 3). Indigenous groups in southeast Asia have argued that the use by the United States of herbicides (e.g. Agent Orange) in Vietnam in the 1960s and 1970s and chemical weapons in Laos in the 1970s was ecodical and genocidal in intent (Andrew Gray, personal communication). Efforts to conserve land and species have also led to a growing number of 'invisible refugees' around the world, some of whom see themselves as victims of "coercive conservation" (Hitchcock, 1997). It has also been argued that the destruction of bison on the Great Plains in the 19<sup>th</sup> century was aimed specifically at destroying the peoples who were dependent on this species for their survival (Matthiessen, 1991, p. 16).

## **Protection of Indigenous People and Prosecution of Perpetrators**

Human rights organizations have argued that specific cases of genocide should be worked up through the collection of evidence and then prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. The former can be accomplished in part through the application of archaeological and forensic techniques aimed at determining the causes of death and identities of individuals, as was done, for example, in the case of the Kurds killed during the Anfal Campaign of the Iraqi government and army in 1988 (Middle East Watch and Physicians for Human Rights, 1988; Whitley, 1994; Goldberg, 2002). Subsequently, that evidence, as well as other types, should be presented to international tribunals and courts (e.g. the International Criminal Court) and state-level courts and institutions that can try cases of human rights violations.

Organizations established at the national level to provide assistance to indigenous peoples have been relatively unsuccessful in ensuring the long-term survival of the people they are charged with protecting. Beyond that, some organizations have actually been involved in harming groups of indigenous peoples. The National Foundation for the Indian (FUNAI) in Brazil, for example, has engaged in pacification programs and has facilitated the process whereby Indians have been removed from their lands (Davis, 1977; Bodley, 1999, pp. 68, 84; Albert, 1992; Amnesty International, 1992c; Rabben, 1997, pp. 87-95). In the Philippines, the tribal peoples' agency known as the Presidential Assistant

on National Minorities (PANAMIN) was involved from 1968 to 1984 in carrying out resettlement and development programs, some of which had devastating effects on indigenous peoples (Duhaylungsod and Hydman, 1992, pp. 67-68). FUNAI, PANAMIN, and other national indigenous peoples' organizations have sometimes worked closely with international development agencies and multinational corporations in their efforts to establish projects that have had deleterious social and environmental impacts. Some of these projects have been accompanied by the intentional killings of indigenous residents of the areas being developed (Survival International, 1990, 1991, 1992, 1996, 2005; Gedicks, 1993, 2001; Hitchcock 1997, 1999). Responses of indigenous groups to intensified pressure and genocidal actions ranged from peaceful protests and appeals to governments and pleas to human rights agencies for help to the establishment of grassroots political movements and armed resistance (Burger, 1987; Durning, 1992; Neitschmann, 1994; Maybury Lewis 1997, 2002; Jackson and Warren, 2005).

Given the prevailing attitudes toward indigenous peoples, it is not surprising that in the vast majority of instances those responsible for killing them were never brought to justice. According to Amnesty International (1992a), the phenomenon of impunity, or tacit protection from prosecution, is one of the crucial factors contributing to the continuing pattern of genocidal acts and human rights violations against indigenous peoples (p. 71). After several centuries of genocide, it was only in the latter part of the 1980's that the Brazilian government actually brought federal charges of genocide against individuals. In 1988, five men were accused of intending to "exterminate or eliminate an ethnic group or race" in their murder of a number of Xacriaba Indians (Chalk and Jonassohn, 1990, p. 414). Other countries in Latin America (Colombia,

Bolivia) and Southeast Asia (Malaysia) have also considered trying people for these crimes.

Very few cases of human rights violations against indigenous people by agents of governments have resulted in punishment of the offenders. For the most part, agents of governments accused of genocide of indigenous peoples have been quick to deny the charges. For example, when accused of genocidal acts against the Ache Indians of Paraguay, the country's defense Minister argued that, by definition, genocide was not perpetrated. In doing so, he made the assertion that: "Although there are victims and victimizer, there is not the third element necessary to establish the crime of genocide-that is "intent," Therefore, as there is no "intent," one cannot speak of genocide (quoted in Lewis, 1976, p. 63).

A similar defense was presented by the Permanent Representative of Brazil to the United Nations in 1969, who argued that crimes committed against Brazilian indigenous populations could not be seen as genocide because (1) they never eliminated Indians as an ethnic or cultural group, and (2) the actions were committed for "exclusively, economic reasons" and therefore lacked "the special malice or motivation necessary" to be characterized as genocide. (United Nations Human Rights Communication No. 478, 29 September 1969, cited in Kuper, 1984, p. 33). Taken to its logical extreme, this argument would mean that practically none of the actions against indigenous peoples that are obviously genocidal in nature could be described as genocide.

Over the past several decades, efforts have been made by a wide variety of agencies, nongovernmental organizations, and individuals to promote the interests of indigenous peoples and to educate the public about their situations (Sanders, 1989;

Swepston, 1989; Burger, 1990; Bodley, 1999, pp. 174-201; Jackson and Warren, 2005). These efforts have included the documentation of human rights abuses, working directly with individuals and groups whose rights have been violated to try to obtain legal redress, bringing pressure to bear on governments and agencies involved in activities deleterious to indigenous peoples, and providing funds and technical assistance to indigenous groups seeking to improve their lives. The work of these organizations has been constrained, however, by lack of funds and political support.

The activities of indigenous peoples' rights organizations have not been without controversy. In the 1970s, for example, the London-based non-government organization Survival International stated that the government of Paraguay had committed genocide against the Ache Indians (Arens, 1976, 1978; Smith and Melia, 1978; Survival International, 1988a, 1993). Some of the documentation of the human rights violations against the Ache was also published by another indigenous support group, the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (Munzel 1973, 1974). These allegations of massive human rights violations against the Ache were rejected not only by the governments of Paraguay, the United States, Britain, and West Germany, but also by Cultural Survival, an American indigenous peoples' support organization (Maybury-Lewis and Howe, 1980). The denial of the occurrence of genocide of the Ache was based in part upon a definitional question relating to whether or not there had been a "planned or conscious effort on the part of the government of Paraguay to exterminate, molest, or harm the Ache Indians in any way" (Survival International, 1993, p. 5). Intent, of course, can be inferred from the actions on the ground. As far as could be ascertained, over 100

Ache were killed. Government officials made various comments about the Ache needing to be done way with, and such comments were recorded by researchers.

Clearly, definitional issues are of major importance in the discussions concerning physical and cultural genocide. Equally as clear is the fact that the protection of indigenous groups from genocide would be enhanced if there were greater cooperation and coordination among the various organizations involved with indigenous peoples' welfare.

### **What the Genocides of Indigenous Peoples Have Taught Us**

Many countries have made rhetorical commitments' to enforce laws with respect to freedom of association, access to fair and impartial judicial procedures, and elimination of discriminatory minorities. In practice, however, numerous countries have engaged in repressive actions against their citizens. Most states, along with the United Nations, have been reluctant to criticize individual nations for their actions on the pretense that this would constitute a violation of sovereignty. They have also tended to accept government denials of genocides at face value. As a result, genocidal actions continue.

In the twentieth century dozens of indigenous peoples were the victims of physical and cultural genocide. The lack of teeth behind the rhetorical commitment to the protection of indigenous peoples' rights has been, and continues to be, a tremendous problem. If the gross violations of human rights of indigenous peoples are to be stopped, then efforts must be made to enforce existing international human rights law and to

impose sanctions on those countries, institutions, agencies, and individuals responsible for genocidal actions. Attempts must also be made to develop genocide early warning systems and to determine the preconditions for genocide (Kuper, 1985, pp. 218-219; Chalk and Jonassohn, 1990, p. 4).

A major lesson learned from the experiences of indigenous peoples harmed by development projects is that detailed social and environmental impact assessments and careful consultations with local people must be carried out prior to the implementation of any projects. It is also evident that development agencies must provide for the legal protection of the lives and assets of people affected by projects. Failure to do so should result in the cutting off of all financial support for those agencies.

The protection of indigenous peoples from genocide at the international level has generally been ineffective. Few cases of genocide against indigenous peoples have been brought before the Commission on Human Rights of the United Nations. Those who have brought complaints to the United Nations have learned that the international agency does not provide redress for alleged human rights violations. In addition, they have discovered that the United Nations does not have the capacity or, according to some, the commitment, to provide direct protection from perpetrators of human rights violations. If this is to be effective, however, substantial efforts will need to be made to gain detailed knowledge of the situation on the ground before such interventions are attempted; and thus, that is a second major lesson learned.

There have been investigations by forensic anthropologists, medical doctors, and lawyers of cases where genocides and massive human rights violations were alleged to have occurred, as seen, for example, in cases ranging from Argentina and Guatemala to

Rwanda and Sri Lanka (Koff, 2005). While these investigations have had positive impacts in terms of documenting tragedies and providing information to survivors about what happened to relatives and friends, the evidence obtained has yet to be brought forward in trials of people accused of genocide, war crimes, and massive human rights violations). Thus, the third lesson learned is that follow-through on cases of genocide is crucial.

There are a number of different ways in which indigenous peoples and organizations working with indigenous groups can address issues of genocide and massive human rights violations. One way is to educate the public about genocide in general and genocides of indigenous peoples specifically. Incorporating information on indigenous peoples' genocides in curricula of schools, colleges, and universities is crucial, as is making such information available on websites and in materials distributed to international agencies, governments, non-government organizations, and the public at large.

It would be very useful if coordination among groups promoting indigenous peoples rights was enhanced. Efforts need to be made to bring together indigenous peoples and indigenous advocacy groups to discuss genocides and human rights with an eye toward coming up with recommendations on genocide prevention, early warning systems, monitoring systems, and ways to deal with genocides and massive human rights violations once they occur.

There are cases where indigenous groups and their supporters have sought legal redress against companies that have pursued policies that have caused destruction of indigenous peoples and their habitats (Gedicks, 2001; Joseph 2004). Examples of such



actions include those of the Waorani of the Oriente region of Ecuador, who sued Texaco (now ChevronTexaco) in federal court in Los Angeles under the Alien Claims Torts Act of 1789. The case was filed in 1993 by an Ecuadorian-born, Massachusetts-based international human rights lawyer named Christobal Bonifaz. It was dismissed in 1996, and again in 2001 on jurisdictional grounds. Mr. Bonifaz then brought the case to Ecuador. In 2006, it was re-filed in San Francisco, California and is still pending (Stephens, 2007, p. A 18).

In 2006, local people in Myanmar brought legal action against Unocal, an American oil company, also under the Alien Claims Torts Act (Baue, 2006). It resulted in a settlement in March 2005, and constituted the first case in which a major multinational corporation paid cash to the people who brought the lawsuit. Efforts to change the behavior of UNOCAL were recommended by stockholders, leading to UNOCAL giving up its activities in Burma. Various indigenous peoples have also called for stockholder action against companies involved in corporate and environmental crime.

Not only should legal cases against corporations be pursued, in the opinions of some indigenous peoples, but so should legal redress be sought against individuals such as the chief executive officers (CEOs) of transnational corporations, an example being the CEOs of Union Carbide for the Bhopal, India disaster and of Total, the French oil company, for its involvement in slave labor in Myanmar. It has also been recommended by some indigenous peoples' spokespersons that members of the public should divest themselves of holdings in companies that engage in actions that lead to human rights violations and environmental destruction. In addition, the pursuit of legal cases against

corporations has led to greater awareness of social responsibility on the part of transnationals.

There are numerous other ways that indigenous peoples can protect themselves from genocides and human rights violations. One strategy is to develop indicators for indigenous peoples' well-being that indigenous groups and non-government organizations working with them can monitor (see Taylor, 2004). A second strategy is to provide training to indigenous community-based organizations and communities in human rights and conflict resolution. Provision of education and literacy programs will also go a long way towards facilitating indigenous groups' recording of their own histories, obtaining testimonies, and collecting materials that can be disseminated in order to increase awareness of the wide array of human rights issues facing indigenous peoples. Yet another strategy for indigenous organizations and anthropologists is to conduct detailed demographic studies, as was done, for example, by Hill and Hurtado (1995) on the Ache of eastern Paraguay, in order to determine mortality rates and causes of death among indigenous peoples.

Indigenous organizations, local leaders, and advocacy groups all maintain that it is necessary to have security rights -- that is, those rights involving protection of the person. Some indigenous groups have sought to protect themselves through capacity-building of local institutions and working out agreements with local police and militaries. Another strategy employed by indigenous peoples has been to gain recognition of indigenous peoples' rights at the international level and through the courts. On September 13, 2006, the United Nations General Assembly passed the Declaration on the

Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Only four states voted against the declaration: Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and the United States. The issue now for indigenous peoples and their supporters around the world will be to ensure that the principles enshrined in the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples are implemented. Indigenous peoples have had some success in gaining state recognition of land and resource rights in Australia (Young, 1995; Taylor, 2004), Canada (Anaya, 1996, p. 131), New Zealand (Wishart, 2001), and South Africa (Chan, 2004; Chennels and Du Toit, 2004). Obtaining greater civil and political rights, especially the right to participate in decision-making and policy formulation, however, remain a yet-to-be realized goal for most indigenous peoples.

The failure to prevent genocide of indigenous peoples is the result of a combination of factors, including government inaction, bureaucratic inefficiency, and lack of enforcement of international human rights law, racism, and outright greed. Experience has taught us that genocide cannot be prevented unless the perpetrators perceive that the costs of their actions will outweigh the benefits. Without efforts to document cases of genocide and to impose penalties on those governments and agencies responsible, killings and disappearances will be commonplace occurrences not just for indigenous groups but for many of the world's peoples.

### **Acknowledgments**

Support of the research upon which this paper is based was provided by the U.S. National Science Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the International Work Group for Indigenous

Affairs (IWGIA), Hivos, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), the Danish International Development Authority (DANIDA), and Rotary International. We wish to thank the indigenous and other peoples and individuals to whom we spoke in the process of compiling and analyzing the data. Israel Charny provided useful insights on genocide issues. We also wish to thank Adrienne M. Daggett for her editorial suggestions and recommendations for improvement of the chapter.

## References

Africa Watch (1989). *Zimbabwe, A Break with the Past? Human Rights and Political Unity*. New York and Washington, D.C.: Africa Watch Committee.

Africa Watch (1990). *Somalia: A Government at War With Its Own People. Testimonies about the Killings and the Conflict in the North*. New York: Human Rights Watch.

African Rights (1995a). *Facing Genocide: The Nuba of Sudan*. London: African Rights.

African Rights (1996). *Rwanda: Killing the Evidence: Murders, Attacks, Arrests, and Intimidation of Survivors and Witnesses*. London: African Rights.

Albert, Bruce (1992). "Indian Lands, Environmental Policy and Military Geopolitics in the Development of the Brazilian Amazon: The Case of the Yanomami."

*Development and Change* 23(1): 35-70.

Albert, Bruce (1994). "Gold Miners and Yanomami Indians in the Brazilian Amazon: The Hashimu Massacre," pp. 47-55. In Barbara Rose Johnston (Ed.) *Who Pays the Price? The Sociocultural Context of Environmental Crisis*. Washington D.C. and Covelo, CA: Island Press.

American Anthropological Association (1991). *Report of the Special Commission to Investigate the Situation of the Brazilian Yanomami, June, 1991*. Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association.

Amnesty International (1992a). *Human Rights Violations Against Indigenous Peoples of the Americas*. New York: Amnesty International.

Amnesty International (1992b). *United States of America: Human Rights and American Indians*. New York: Amnesty International.

Anaya, S. James (1996). *Indigenous Peoples in International Law*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Anti-Slavery Society (1984). *The Chittagong Hill Tracts: Militarization, Oppression, and the Hill Tribes*. Indigenous Peoples and Development Series, No. 2.

London: Anti-Slavery Society.

Arens, Richard (1976). "Introduction," pp. 1-16. In Richard Arens (Ed.) *Genocide in Paraguay*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Arens, Richard (1978). *The Forest Indians in Stroessner's Paraguay: Survival or Extinction?* Survival International Document Series, No. 4. London: Survival International.

Arens, Richard (Ed.) (1976). *Genocide in Paraguay*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Barkan, Elazar (2003). "Genocides of Indigenous Peoples: Rhetoric of Human Rights," pp. 117-139. In Robert Gellately and Ben Kiernan (Eds.) *The Specter of Genocide: Mass Murder in Historical Perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Barta, Tony (1987). "Relations of Genocide: Land and Lives in the Colonization of Australia," pp. 237-251. In Isidor Walliman and Michael N. Dobkowski (Eds.) *Genocide and the Modern Age: Etiology and Case Studies of Mass Death*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Baue, Bruce (2006). Win or Lose in Court: Alien claims Torts Act Pushes Corporate Respect for Human Rights. *Business Ethics*, Summer, 34(1): 12-13.

Bergner, D. (2003). "The Most Unconventional Weapon." *The New York Times Magazine*, October 28, pp. 48-53.

Bhengra, Ratnaker, C.R. Bijoy, and Shirreichon Luithui (1998). *The Adivasis of India*. London: Minority Rights Group International.

Bodley, John (1999). *Victims of Progress*. Fourth Edition. Mountain View, California: Mayfield.

Brantlinger, Patrick (2003). *Dark Vanishings: Discourse on the Extinction of Primitive Races 1800-1930*. Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press.

Carmarck, Robert M. (Ed.) (1988). *Harvest of Violence: The Maya Indians and the Guatemalan Crisis*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Carroll, John M. (Ed.) (1973). *The Sand Creek Massacre: A Documented History*. New York: Sol Lewis.

- Castillo, Beatriz Huertas (2004). *Indigenous Peoples in Isolation in the Peruvian Amazon*. Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs.
- Catholic Justice and Peace Commission and Legal Resources Foundation (1997). *Report on Massacres and Atrocities in Matabeleland, Zimbabwe 1982-87*. Harare: Catholic Justice and Peace Commission and Legal Resources Foundation
- Chagnon, Napoleon A. (1993a). "Anti-Science and Native Rights: Genocide of the Yanomami." *Human Behavior and Evolution Society Newsletter* 2(3):1-4.
- Chagnon, Napoleon A. (1993b). "Covering Up the Yanomamo Massacre." *The New York Times*. October 23, p. 13.
- Chagnon, Napoleon A. (1993c). "Killed by Kindness? The Dubious Influence of the Salesian Missions in Amazonas." *Times Literary Supplement*, December 24, 1993, pp. 11-12.
- Chalk, Frank and Kurt Jonassohn (1990). *The History and Sociology of Genocide: Analyses and Case Studies*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Chittagong Hill Tracts Commission (1991a). "*Life Is Not Ours*": *Land and Human Rights in the Chittagong Hill Tracts, Bangladesh. Report of the Chittagong Hill*



*Tracts Commission*. Copenhagen and London; International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs and Anti-Slavery International.

Chittagong Hill Tracts Commission (1991b). *“Life is Not Ours”: Land and Human Rights in the Chittagong Hill Tracts, Bangladesh: The Report of the Chittagong Hill Tracts Commission 1991*. Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs.

Chittagong Hill Tracts Commission (1992). *“Life is Not Ours”: Land and Human Rights in the Chittagong Hill Tracts, Bangladesh. An Update of the May 1991 Report*. Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs.

Chittagong Hill Tracts Commission (1994). *“Life is Not Ours”: Land and Human Rights in the Chittagong Hill Tracts, Bangladesh: Update 2*. Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs.

Chittagong Hill Tracts Commission (1997). *“Life is Not Ours”: Land and Human Rights in the Chittagong Hill Tracts, Bangladesh: Update 3*. Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs.

Chittagong Hill Tracts Commission (2000). *“Life is Not Ours”: Land and Human Rights in the Chittagong Hill Tracts, Bangladesh: Update 4*. Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs.

Chowdhury, Akram H. (1989). "Self-Determination, the Chittagong, and Bangladesh,"

pp. 292-301. In David P. Forsythe (Ed.) *Human Rights and Development:*

*International Views*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Clay, Jason (1984). "Genocide in the Age of Enlightenment." *Cultural Survival*

*Quarterly* 12(3):1.

Crow Dog, Mary, and Richard Erdoes (1990). *Lakota Woman*. New York: Grove

Weidenfeld.

Dadrian, Vahakn N. (1975). "A Typology of Genocide." *International Review of Modern*

*Sociology* 5 (2):201-212.

Daes, Erica-Irene A. (2005). "Indigenous Peoples," pp. 508-516. In Dinah L. Shelton,

(Ed.) *Encyclopedia of Genocide Crimes against Humanity*. Detroit, MI: Thomson

Gale.

Davis, Shelton (1977). *Victims of the Miracle: Development and the Indians of Brazil*.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Erni, Chris (2006). *Strategy and Work Priorities for IWGLA's Work Program*.

Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs.

Falla, Ricardo (1994). *Massacres in the Jungle: Ixcán, Guatemala, 1975-1982*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Fein, Helen (1984). "Scenarios of Genocide: Models of Genocide and Critical Responses," pp. 3-31. In Israel W. Charny (Ed.) *Toward the Understanding and Prevention of Genocide: Proceedings of the International Conference on the Holocaust and Genocide*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Fein, Helen (1990). Special Issue: Genocide: A Sociological Perspective. *Current Sociology* 38(1):1-126.

Gedicks, Al (1993). *The New Resource Wars: Native and Environmental Struggles Against Environmental Corporations*. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Gedicks, Al (2001). *Resource Rebels: Native Challenges to Mining and Oil Corporations*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Gellately, Robert and Ben Kiernan (Eds.) (2003). *The Specter of Genocide: Mass Murder in Historical Perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Goldberg, Jeffrey (2002). "The Great Terror." *The New Yorker*, March 25, 2002, pp. 52-75.

- Gordon, Robert J. (1985). "Conserving Bushmen to Extinction in Southern Africa: The Metaphysics of Bushman Hating and Empire Building," pp. 28-42. In Marcus Colchester (Ed.) *An End to Laughter? Tribal Peoples and Economic Development*. London: Survival International.
- Gordon, Robert G. (1988). "The Rise of the Bushman Penis: Germans, Genitalia, and Genocide." *African Studies* 57(1):27-54.
- Gordon, Robert G. (in press) "Hidden in Full View: The 'Forgotten' Bushman Genocides of Namibia." *Genocide Studies and Prevention*.
- Gordon, Robert G. and Stuart Sholto Douglas (2000). *The Bushman Myth: The Making of a Namibian Underclass*. Second Edition. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Gurr, Ted Robert (2000). *Peoples Versus States: Minorities at Risk in the New Century*. Washington, D.C.: The United States Institute of Peace Press.
- Gurr, Ted Robert and James R. Scaritt (1989). "Minorities Rights at Risk: A Global Survey." *Human Rights Quarterly* 11(3):375-405.
- Hays, Jennifer (2007) *Education, Rights, and Survival for the Nyae Nyae Ju/'hoansi: Illuminating Global and Local Discourses*. Ph.D. Dissertation, State University

of New York at Albany.

Heinz, Wolfgang (1988). *Indigenous Populations, Ethnic Minorities, and Human Rights*.

Berlin: Quorum Verlag.

Hitchcock, Robert K. (1985). "The Plight of Indigenous Peoples." *Social Education*

49(6): 457-462.

Hitchcock, Robert K. (1994). 'International Human Rights, the Environment, and

Indigenous Peoples.' *Colorado Journal of International Environmental Law and Policy* 5(1):1-22.

Hitchcock, Robert K. (1995) "Centralization, Resource Depletion, and Coercive

Conservation among the Tyua of the Northeastern Kalahari." *Human Ecology* 23(2):169-198.

Hitchcock, Robert K. (1997). "Indigenous Peoples, Multinational Corporations, and

Human Rights." *Indigenous Affairs* 1997/2:6-11.

Hitchcock, Robert K. (1999). 'Indigenous Peoples, Genocide of,' pp. 349-354. In Israel

W. Charny (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of Genocide, Volume II, I-Y*, Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.

Hitchcock, Robert K. and Thomas Koperski (2008). "Genocides of Indigenous Peoples," pp. 577-617. In Dan Stone (Ed.) *Historiography of Genocide*. New York and London: Palgrave.

Hoig, Stan (1961). *The Sand Creek Massacre*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Horowitz, Irving Louis (2002). *Taking Lives: Genocide and State Power*. Fifth Edition, Revised. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Human Rights Watch (1992) *Endless Torment: The 1991 Uprising in Iraq and Its Aftermath*. New York: Author.

Human Rights Watch (2003a) *Covered in Blood: Ethnically Targeted Violence in Northern DRC*. New York: Author.

Human Rights Watch (2003b). *The Iraqi Government Assault on the Marsh Arabs*. New York: Author.

Hyndman, David (1994). *Ancestral Rain Forests and the Mountain of Gold: Indigenous Peoples and Mining in New Guinea*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (1988). *IWGIA Yearbook 1987: Indigenous Peoples and Development*. Copenhagen: IWGIA.

Jackson, Jean and Kay B. Warren (2005). "Indigenous Movements in Latin America: Controversies, Ironies, New Directions." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34: 49-73.

Johnston, Barbara Rose (2005). *Chixoy Dam Legacy Issues Study. Volume 1: Executive Summary Consequential Damages and Reparation: Recommendations for Remedy. Volume 2: Document Review and Chronology of Relevant Actions and Events. Volume 3: Consequential Damage Assessment of Chixoy River Basin Communities.* Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Political Ecology, March 17, 2005.  
<http://www.centerforpoliticalecology.org>.

Johnston, Barbara Rose (2006). 'Banking on Violence? Guatemalan Genocide and U.S. Security.' *CounterPunch*, August 19/20. Accessed at:  
[www.counterpunch.org/hohnston08192006.html](http://www.counterpunch.org/hohnston08192006.html)

Joseph, Sarah (2004). *Corporations and Transnational Human Rights Litigation.* London: Hart Publishing,

Kazmi, Sayyed Nadeem and Stuart M. Leiderman (2004). "Twilight People: Iraq's Marsh Inhabitants." *Human Rights Dialogue: Environmental Rights.* Accessed at:  
[www/Carnegiecouncil.org/viewMedia.php](http://www/Carnegiecouncil.org/viewMedia.php).

Koff, Clea (2005). *The Bone Woman: A Forensic Anthropologist's Search for Truth in the Mass Graves of Rwanda, Bosnia, Croatia, and Kosovo*. New York: Random House.

Krech, Shepard (1994). Genocide in Tribal Society. *Nature* 371 (1729) :14-15.

Kuper, Leo (1981). *Genocide: Its Political Use in the Twentieth Century*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Kuper, Leo (1982). *International Action against Genocide*. Minority Rights Group Report 53. London: Minority Rights Group.

Kuper, Leo (1984). "Types of Genocide and Mass Murder," pp. 32-47. In Israel W. Charny (Ed.) *Toward the Understanding and Prevention of Genocide: Proceedings of the International Conference on the Holocaust and Genocide*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Kuper, Leo (1985). *The Prevention of Genocide*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Kuper, Leo (1991). "When Denial Becomes Routine." *Social Education* 55(2):121-123.



Kuper, Leo (1992). "Reflections on the Prevention of Genocide," pp. 135-151. In Helen Fein (Ed.) *Genocide Watch*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Leary, John D. (1995). *Violence and the Dream People: The Orang Asli in the Malayan Emergency, 1948-1960*. Athens: Ohio University Press.

Legters, Lyman H. (1988). "The American Genocide: Pathologies of Indian-White Relations." *Policy Studies Journal* 16(4): 768-777.

Lehtola, Veli-Pekka (2004). *The Saami People: Traditions in Transition*. Fairbanks: University of Alaska Press.

Lewis, Norman (1969). "Genocide-From Fire and Sword to Arsenic and Bullet, Civilization Has Sent Six Million Indians to Extinction." *Sunday Times Magazine* [London], February, 234 (8): 41-48.

Manz, Beatrice (1988). *Refugees of a Hidden War: The Aftermath of Counterinsurgency in Guatemala*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Martinez Cobo, Jose R. (1987). *Study of the Problem of Discrimination Against Indigenous Populations. Volume V: Conclusions, Proposals, and Recommendations*. New York: United Nations.

Matthiessen, Peter (1983). *In the Spirit of Crazy Horse*. New York: Penguin.

Maybury-Lewis, David (1997). *Indigenous Peoples, Ethnic Groups, and the State*.

Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Maybury-Lewis, David (2002). "Genocide against Indigenous Peoples," pp. 43-53. In

Alexander Labhan Hinton (Ed.) *Annihilating Difference: The Anthropology of Genocide*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Maybury-Lewis, David and, Howe, James (1980). *The Indian Peoples of Paraguay:*

*Their Plight and Their Prospects*. Cultural Survival Special Reports No. 2.

Cambridge, MA: Cultural Survival Inc.

Menchu, Rigoberta (1984). *I, Rigoberta Menchu, An Indian Woman of Guatemala*.

Edited and Introduced by Elisabeth Burgos-Debray. London: Verso Editions.

Mey, Wolfgang (Ed.) (1984). *Genocide in the Chittagong Hill Tracts. IWGIA Document*

*No. 51*. Copenhagen, Denmark: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs.

Middle East Watch (1992). *Endless Torment: The 1991 Uprising in Iraq and Its*

*Aftermath*. New York: Middle East Watch.

Middle East Watch and Physicians for Human Rights (1992). *Unquiet Graves: The Search for the Disappeared in Iraqi Kurdistan*. Washington, D.C. and New York:

Middle East Watch and Physicians for Human Rights.

Middle East Watch and Physicians for Human Rights (1993). *The Anfal Campaign in Iraqi Kurdistan: The Destruction of Koreme*. New York: Human Rights Watch and Physicians for Human Rights.

Minority Rights Group International (2007). *World Directory of Minorities 2007*. London: Minority Rights Group International.

Montejo, Victor (1987). *Testimony: Death of a Guatemalan Village*. Willimantic, CT: Curbstone Press.

Montejo, Victor (n.d.). "Testimony of Violence in Guatemala: A Mayan Indian Account." Unpublished manuscript. University of California, Davis. Department of Native American Studies.

Munzel, Mark (1973). *The Ache Indians: Genocide in Paraguay*. IWGIA Document No. 11. Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs.

Munzel, Mark (1974). *The Ache: Genocide Continues in Paraguay*. Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs.

Niezen, Ronald (2003) *The Origins of Indigenism: Human Rights and the Politics of Identity*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Nettle, D. and S. Romaine (2000). *Vanishing Voices: The Extinction of the World's Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Palmer, Alison (1992). "Ethnocide," pp. 1-6. In Michael N. Dobkowski and Isidor Wallimann (Eds.) *Genocide in Our Time: An Annotated Bibliography with Analytical Introductions*. Ann Arbor, MI: The Pierian Press.

Partow, Hassan (2001). *The Mesopotamian Marshlands: Demise of an Ecosystem*. Geneva: United Nations Environment Program.

Perry, Richard J. (1996). *From Time Immemorial: Indigenous Peoples and State Systems*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Rabben, Linda (1998). *Unnatural Selection: The Yanomami, the Kayapao, and the Onslaught of Civilization*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.

Roy, Chandra Raikumari (2000). *Land Rights of the Indigenous Peoples of the Chittagong Hill Tracts, Bangladesh*. Copenhagen, Denmark: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs.

Sachs, Aaron (1995). *Eco-Justice: Linking Human Rights and the Environment*.

*WorldWatch Paper 127*. Washington, D.C.: WorldWatch Institute.

Sachs, Aaron (1996). "Upholding Human Rights and Environmental Justice," pp. 133-

151. In Lester Brown (Ed.) *State of the World 1996*. Washington, D.C.:

WorldWatch Institute.

Sanders, Douglas (1989). The UN Working Group on Indigenous Populations. *Human*

*Rights Quarterly* 11(3):406-433.

Sanders, Douglas (1991). Collective Rights. *Human Rights Quarterly* 13 (3) :368-386.

Sanford, Victoria (2003). *Buried Secrets: Truth and Human Rights in Guatemala*. New

York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000) *Linguistic Genocide in Education – or Worldwide Diversity*

*and Human Rights?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Smith, R.C. and B. Melia (1978). Genocide of the Ache-Guayaki? *Survival International*

3(1):8-13.

Smith, Roger W. (1987). "Human Destructiveness and Politics: The Twentieth Century as an Age of Genocide," pp. 21-38. In Isidor Walliman and Michael N. Dobkowski (Eds.) *Genocide and the Modern Age: Etiology and Case Studies of Mass Death*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Sponsel, Leslie (1994). "The Yanomami Holocaust Continues," pp. 43-46. In Barbara Rose Johnston (Ed.) *Who Pays the Price? The Sociocultural Context of Environmental Crisis*. Washington D.C. and Covelo, CA: Island Press.

Sponsel, Leslie (1997). "The Master Thief: Gold Mining and Mercury Contamination in the Amazon, pp. 99-127. In Barbara Rose Johnston (Ed.) *Life and Death Matters: Human Rights and the Environment at the End of the Millennium*. Walnut Creek, California: AltaMira Press.

Stephens, Bret (2007). "Amazonian Swindle." *The Wall Street Journal*, October 20, p. A18.

Stidsen, Sille (2007a). "Editorial," pp. 10-15. In Sille Stidsen (Ed.) *The Indigenous World 2007*. Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs.

Stidsen, Sille (Ed.). (2007b). *The Indigenous World 2007*. Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs.

Stoll, David (1993). *Between Two Armies in the Ixil Towns of Guatemala*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Stoll, David (1999). *Rigoberta Menchu and the Story of All Poor Guatemalans*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Survival International (1990). *Ecuador: Oil Companies Force 700 Waorani off Their Land*. Urgent Action Bulletin, March 1990. London: Survival International.

Survival International (1991). *Indonesia: Paper Companies to Fell Tribal Forests*. Urgent Action Bulletin, April 1991. London: Survival International.

Survival International (1992). *Ecuador: Dallas Oil Company to Invade Waorani Land*. Urgent Action Bulletin, July 1992. London: Survival International.

Survival International (1993). *The Denial of Genocide*. London: Survival International.

Survival International (1996). *Mobil Threatens Uncontacted Indians in the Peruvian Amazon*. Urgent Action Bulletin, June 1996. London: Survival International.

Survival International (2000). *The EU and the World Bank: European and World Bank Policies – A Betrayal?* Urgent Action Bulletin, October 2000. London: Survival International.

Survival International (2005). *Rio Pardo. Brazil: Un-contacted Tribe Faces Genocide.*

Urgent Action Bulletin, June 2005. London: Survival International.

Suzman, James (2001b). *An Assessment of the Status of San in Namibia.* Windhoek, Namibia: Legal Assistance Center.

Synott, John P. (1993). "Genocide and Cover-up Practices of the British Colonial System Against Australian Aborigines, 1788-1992." *Internet on the Holocaust and Genocide* 44-46:15-16.

Tatz, Colin (1991). "Australia's Genocide: They Soon Forget Their Offspring." *Social Education* 55(2):97-98.

Tatz, Colin (2003). *With Intent to Destroy: Reflecting on Genocide.* London and New York: Verso.

Taylor, John (2004). *Indigenous Peoples and Indicators of Well-Being: An Australian Perspective.* Center for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research Working Paper No. 33. Canberra: Center for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research, Australian National University.



- Thornton, Russell (1987). *American Indian Holocaust and Survival: A Population History Since 1492*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Totten, Samuel (1991). 'Introduction,' pp. xi-lxxv. In Samuel Totten (Compiler/Ed.) *First Person Accounts of Genocidal Acts Committed in the Twentieth Century: An Annotated Bibliography*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Totten, Samuel (2004). "The Intervention and Prevention of Genocide: Where There Is the Political Will, There is a Way." pp. 469-490. In Samuel Totten, William S. Parsons, and Israel W. Charny (Eds.) *Century of Genocide: Critical Essays and Eyewitness Accounts*. Second Edition. New York and London: Routledge.
- Totten, Sam, William S. Parsons, Jr. and Robert K. Hitchcock (2002). "Confronting Genocide and Ethnocide of Indigenous Peoples: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Definition, Intervention, Prevention, and Adequacy," pp. 54-91. In Alexander Labhan Hinton (Ed.) *Annihilating Difference: The Anthropology of Genocide*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Warren, Kay B. (1998). *Indigenous Movements and Their Critics: Pan-Maya Activism in Guatemala*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Weyler, Rex (1982). *Blood of the Land: The Government and Corporate War against the American Indian Movement*. New York: Vintage Books.

- Whitley, Andrew (1994). "The Remains of Anfal." *Middle East Report* (July-August), pp. 8-11.
- Wilkinson, Daniel (2002). *Silence on the Mountain: Stories of Terror, Betrayal, and Forgetting in Guatemala*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Wiley, P. (1990). *Prehistoric Warfare on the Great Plains*. New York: Garland.
- Wilmer, Franke (1993). *The Indigenous Voice in World Politics: Since Time Immemorial*. Newbury Park, California and London: Sage Publications.
- Wishart, David J. (2001). "Belated Justice? The Indian Claims Commission and the Waitangi Tribunal." *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 25(1):81-111.
- Wolf, Eric (1982). *Europe and the People without History*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- World Bank (2005a). "Operational Directive 4-10: Indigenous Peoples." In *World Bank Operational Manual*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

World Bank (2005b). Bank Procedures 4-10: Indigenous Peoples. In *World Bank Operational Manual*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Young, Elspeth (1995). *Third World in the First: Indigenous Peoples and Development*. London: Routledge.

## **EYEWITNESS ACCOUNTS**

### **Physical and Cultural Genocide of Various Indigenous Peoples**

It is exceptionally difficult to obtain reliable and detailed information on genocides of indigenous peoples. This is particularly true when it comes to locating first-person accounts of genocides involving such groups. One reason for this situation is that many contemporary indigenous groups who have been subjected to genocidal treatment tend to live in out-of-the-way places which are often inaccessible for environmental or political reasons. Documentation of genocidal events against indigenous communities is also rare since those groups residing in remote locations tend to be illiterate or have limited exposure to educational opportunities. Concomitantly, language proficiency of individuals visiting the indigenous communities is often limited at best.

Gathering data on genocides of indigenous peoples is also difficult because in many cases the gross violations of human rights are ongoing. Individuals are reluctant to talk for fear of reprisals. It is not uncommon for people to express deep concern that those responsible for the genocidal acts would retaliate against them and their families for their having revealed what transpired. They therefore are often unwilling to provide information such as their names, identities of relatives, places of residence, and any other data that could be used to determine who they are.

During the course of interviews of indigenous people who have been the victims of atrocities, we found that individuals often address the topic of violence only indirectly or in careful terms. Some of them emphasize that they find it extremely difficult to put into words all that had happened. They describe their experiences in culturally appropriate ways, which means that one has to be reasonably familiar with the languages and cultures of the societies of which they have been a part in order to get at the full meaning of what they are saying.

One of the difficulties faced by anthropologists and others investigating genocidal acts is that most of the existing accounts are not from indigenous groups but rather come from the government, the military, or other agencies who have come in contact with these groups. The problem with these reports is that they are often not based on first-person testimony, and are not as detailed or accurate as ones collected by independent investigators focusing specifically on genocidal acts. In addition, government and military reports sometimes purposely overlook events. There is also the chance of bias on the part of government authorities and military officials who may wish to downplay the severity of the issues.

Fortunately, indigenous peoples themselves are recording their experiences and telling their stories more often now than was the case in the past. This is sometimes done in autobiographical form, as can be seen in the example of Victor Montejo, a Guatemalan Quiche Maya Indian and anthropologist who described an attack on a village, Tzalala, where he was serving as a teacher in September, 1978 (Montejo, 1987). Guatemala, like some other countries in Central and South America, Africa, Asia, and the Pacific where indigenous people exist, saw oppression, genocidal massacres, and massive human rights violations over a 30 year period in the 20th century.

One type of oral testimony obtained from indigenous peoples consists of statements made to investigators, some of whom are human rights workers such as those from African Rights, Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, International Crisis Group, the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs, Survival International, or Cultural Survival. An advantage of these oral histories is that they sometimes are obtained not long after the genocidal events occurred, thus ensuring that the effects of gradual memory loss are minimized, and in this way reducing the chances that subsequent reports have influences on individual perceptions.

Another type of oral testimony on genocides of indigenous peoples is that obtained during the course of interviews designed to get other kinds of information such as life histories of individuals. In such cases, the genocide is not the subject of the discussion and is only alluded to in passing. Once genocidal actions are mentioned, additional details are sought. The difficulty in these situations is that so little is known of the general context in which the genocide occurred that is not easy to ask appropriate and

detailed questions. Under these kinds of conditions, it is hard to assess the validity of the testimony provided.

The oral testimonies presented here have been chosen to illustrate the types of information available on genocides of various indigenous peoples. The accounts are drawn from Bangladesh, Somalia, and Zimbabwe. The first account is taken from the Chittagong Hill Tracts Commission (*Life Is Not Our's": Land and Human Rights in the Chittagong Hill Tracts, Bangladesh: The Report of the Chittagong Hill Tracts Commission, May 1991*). The second set of first-person accounts is drawn from a report by Africa Watch (*Somalia: A Government at War with Its Own People: Testimonies about the Killings and Conflicts in the North*, Washington, D.C. and New York: Africa Watch, 1990). The third oral testimony is one obtained by Robert Hitchcock from a Tyua San man in Western Zimbabwe in June 1989.

### **Account 1: The Tribal Peoples of the Chittagong Hill Tracts, Bangladesh**

The Chittagong Hill Tracts in southeastern Bangladesh, near the border with India and Myanmar (Burma), contain over a dozen distinct tribal peoples, known in South Asia as Adivasi and to themselves collectively as Jummas. Since the founding of the nation-state of Bangladesh in 1971, the peoples of the Chittagong Hills have had to cope with Bangladesh government efforts to pacify and control the region, which has involved counter-insurgency operations, the resettlement of people to protected villages, engagement in land reform and development efforts, and the encouragement of outsiders (Bengali settlers from the plains of Bangladesh) to establish homes and farms in the hills.

The peoples of the Chittagong Hill Tracts are socially, culturally, and linguistically distinct from the majority Bengali population of Bangladesh. Most of the Chittagong tribal peoples are not Moslems but rather Buddhists, Hindus, Christians, or animists, those practicing indigenous religions. The Chittagong Hill Tracts people have been the targets of religious and cultural oppression. Their traditional agricultural practices involving shifting cultivation (also known as *swidden*, or slash and burn, horticulture) have been criticized by the Bangladesh government, which has attempted to transform the land use and tenure system in the Chittagong Hills. The construction of a hydroelectric dam at Kaptai on the Karnafuli River in the Chittagong Hills in the early 1960s saw 100,000 people displaced and over 40% of the arable land in the region inundated. The Bangladesh government has encouraged the development of commercial plantations for coffee, cocoa, and spices, mostly owned by outsiders. Timber concessions have been granted to companies and individuals, and the rate of deforestation in the Chittagong Hills has expanded considerably (Mey, 1984; Chittagong Hill Tracts Commission, 1991; Roy, 2000).

Today the Chittagong Hills have some 600,000 residents, approximately 1% of the total population of Bangladesh. The various indigenous groups, such as the Chakma (Saksa), Mru, Marma, and Tripura, have their own traditions, social systems, forms of leadership, and belief systems and see themselves as distinct from each other. At the same time, they identify themselves as indigenous to the areas where they reside, and they claim customary rights over the land and its resources. Bangladesh government initiatives to reform the land tenure system have met with stiff resistance. The indigenous peoples of the Chittagong Hills have formed political parties, one of which,

the Jana Samhati Samiti (JSS), the People's United Party, has an armed wing, the Shanti Bahini (Peace Forces). The Shanti Bahini, which carried out attacks on government military forces, often in response to massacres and the burnings of villages, was outlawed in both Bangladesh and India.

The peoples of the Chittagong Hills have attempted to negotiate with the Bangladesh government for autonomy for the region, recognition of local peoples' land rights, the establishment of its own legislature, and land recognition of traditional tribal authorities. There has also been a strong desire among the tribal peoples of the Chittagong Hills for the cessation of settlement by outsiders in the hills. The Bangladesh government has responded with increased pressure on the Chittagong Hill populations, engaging in military operations where local people were killed, their homes and farms burned, women were raped, people were forcibly relocated, and temples, churches, and traditional sacred sites destroyed. Sizable numbers of tribal peoples were displaced internally in Bangladesh, while others fled across the borders into Burma and India as refugees. International human rights groups decried what was occurring in the Chittagong Hills, and delegations were sent by organizations such as Amnesty International to investigate the situation.

The Chittagong Hill Tracts Commission is an independent body established to investigate allegations of human rights violations in southeastern Bangladesh. In November 1990, the Chittagong Hill Tracts Commission received permission to visit the region and to conduct interviews of local people, which were carried out in 1990-1991.<sup>i</sup> The testimonies cover a wide range of subjects, from mass murder, disappearances, and rape to destruction of property, involuntary relocation, and religious oppression. Attacks



on temples and worshippers were described by individuals, as seen in this testimony from a Marma monk about an incident that took place in Mani Gram, Khagrachari, in June, 1986:

I was in Man Gram temple. On 12 June 1986 we tried to celebrate a function in the temple. All of a sudden some troops came and said, "What are you doing?" We replied, "We are going to wash our God." The soldiers said, "You cannot wash God because this is a Muslim state. You cannot worship the Lord Buddha; you have to abandon this religion and become Muslim." We refused to do so. Then the soldiers caught us and tied our hands and started to pour water on our heads. I was the only monk there, the others were villagers, numbering around 20. All of us were tied in pairs and the soldiers started pouring water and when they were not satisfied by pouring water they started kicking us with their boots. The water was not just water but it was mixed with green chilies. When we were tied up they stood with bayonets over us so we would not struggle. My skin started burning and most of us were injured as I was. I had cuts and sores on my legs. We were tied up in the afternoon and they started to burn the houses of the village, which we could see. We were tied up from eight in the morning to four in the afternoon, a total of eight hours. The soldiers united us. At about five o'clock they set fire to the temple and we went in to hiding in the jungles. The settlers were not with the soldiers when they tied us up, but were there when the village was burnt. There is a river called Chengi. After coming to the river we went hiding into the deep jungle. After four days trekking all through

the jungle, I reached the border of Tripura and Karbook camp. In that lot were around 450 people. Before 12th June there was no other incident. the only reason for the attack was religion. If we became Muslim we could stay safe. I know one Marma who was my friend called Uchmang. He was threatened that if he did not become a Muslim he would be harmed with his relatives. He was forcibly converted. He came from a different village, Mahalchair in Khagrachari District.

Another testimony comes from a monk in a refugee camp in Tripura about an incident that took place in Panchari in the Chittagong Hills in 1986:

One day 13 of us went to market. I was not a monk then. The Bangladesh Rifles and settlers caught us and out of thirteen, nine were killed and four of us escaped. The reason was that we were not Muslims. They wanted us to be Muslims to take Islam. It was in the market itself and some of the people were also caught up from around. Among the people whom they caught was my wife. They cut her with *daos* (long knives) -- some of the marks on her neck are still there. She is in Karbook (relief camp). This took place in the market itself on market day, Wednesday. The others ran away. They also tried to cut me with *daos* on the neck. Luckily my shirt collar was thick and I escaped from being killed. As they killed the others, they shouted, "Oh, Chakmas, will you not now become Muslim? If you refuse we will kill you now."

## **Account 2: The Isaaks of Somalia**

In 1988, the army of the government of Somalia attacked villages in the northern part of the country with the aim of destroying members of the Isaak clan, one of several clans in Somalia which they blamed for participating in rebellious actions against the state. The justification for these acts was state security.

The Somalia case illustrates a kind of “autogenocide” not unlike that in Cambodia perpetrated by the Khmer Rouge. The genocidal actions in Somalia, like those in Cambodia, were aimed specifically at exterminating members of one’s own ethnic group (Africa Watch, 1990, pp. 1-2). Prior to the outbreak of fighting in northern Somalia, members of the Isaak clan disappeared, some at the hands of the Somalia National Security Service and paramilitary forces whose task was to root out dissent.

An estimated 50,000 to 60,000 people, the majority of them Isaaks, died during the 1980’s, most of them in the period between 1988 and early 1990. Civilians were targeted along with suspected insurgents. The Somalia government forces carried out sweeps of both urban and rural areas, and both massacres and extrajudicial executions occurred. Camel and goat-keeping pastoral nomads were victimized by the Somalia government due to the suspicion they were providing economic support to the insurgents. The following oral testimonies were obtained from several people in the months following the 1988 attacks by Africa Watch and in 1990 by Robert Hitchcock.

The first oral testimony is from a woman named Monda Ahmed Yusuf, who lived in the Tuurta Turwa district of Burao in northern Somalia. She was interviewed by Africa Watch in London, England, on July 2, 1989.

Shelling with long-range weapons started on Sunday. It hit a neighbor's house. The Abdirahman family of seven people. Six of them died instantaneously. The only survivor was a little girl who had been sent to fetch sugar. The mother had just had a baby.

They were after civilians. Their scouts would direct them to those areas where civilians were concentrated and then that spot would be shelled. On Monday, the shelling intensified. Two houses behind ours belonging to my uncle were hit. Luckily, one was empty as the family had congregated in the other house. It hit that house, too, and his daughter, niece and sister-in-law were wounded. Our side was particularly targeted as it was one of the areas the SNM entered when they first came into town. When the bombing started, the sight of the dying, the wounded and the collapse of houses was too much to bear.

The second testimony is that of Khadija Sugul, who described how government forces intentionally separated Isaak clanspeople from non-Isaaks.

If they [Somali government forces] had made any distinctions between SNM<sup>4</sup> fighters and civilians, there wouldn't have been so many casualties and there wouldn't have been so much suffering. What they wanted, to put it simply, was to wipe us out. A hail of bullets came at you from every direction. As we fled Burao, my wife was hit by a bullet and badly wounded. My mother-in-law died when a bomb hit their house. My mother's niece was also killed. So many

people have died..., including so many members of my own extended family.

Only God can count the numbers.

The fourth oral testimony on Somalia is that of Jama Osman Samater, who had been a political prisoner from 1982 through 1988:

I had just come out from the mosque from Friday prayers when I heard the news of the SNM attack on Burao. It was lunchtime. At 2:30 a whistle blew, announcing a curfew. I went home. The next morning I learned that many businessmen and elders had been arrested. I saw soldiers herding people into cars. They were confiscating all vehicles, including taxis, because when the SNM attacked Burao, taxi drivers had helped the SNM. When they couldn't find the keys quickly enough, they punctured the tires and broke the windows. I understood immediately the gravity of the situation. The soldiers were looting food and medicines from the shops and loading them onto cars. The Gulwadaayaal<sup>5</sup> were assisting the soldiers.

As a former political prisoner, I was in danger of being re-arrested. I had to disguise myself. I went into the back of our shop, shaved my head and dressed as a nomad. As I left, I saw two other men arrested. They were "Guun," and Abdillahi Khalif, "Ku Cadeeye," both elders. I don't know what happened to them.

I went towards my house. As I was about to board the bus, one of our shop assistants told me not to go home. Soldiers had just come to the shop

looking for me and they must be on their way to the house. I went to hide at a neighbor's. That night, soldiers and NSS<sup>6</sup> officers went to my house. They took all valuables. One of my little sons screamed "faqash" at them and they slapped him across the ears. We learned later that his eardrum burst. I stayed a second night at a neighbor's house. Then, a friend and I hid ourselves in a big rubbish bin on the outskirts of Hargeisa for an entire day. The next night, the SNM attacked Hargeisa and we came back to town. On our way back, we passed a house near a military checkpoint belonging to Yusuf Elmi Samatar and saw soldiers and a tank on the move. We learned that eighteen civilians, who had fled the city center and taken shelter there, had been killed. They were robbed of everything and some of the women were raped.

We stayed in Hargeisa until June 8. My wife, mother, six children, two sisters and their children gathered in one house. After a few days, the shelling started. It was relentless. They shelled homes, even when no one was in the house. The objective was to ensure that no one escaped alive and no house left to stand. Volleys of artillery were being fired from every direction. There was burning everywhere. In front of my sister's house, a wooden house was hit and eight people, mostly women and children, perished. The shock was so overwhelming that we soon lost any sense of fear.

I realized that my suffering in prison was nothing compared to his. In prison, my pain had affected just me. Here everyone was a victim. The shelling did not discriminate. There were even dead animals, dogs and goats, everywhere. The first dead bodies I saw were two or three traders of Asian origin who had

lived in Somalia for generations. I went to hide in a mosque. I couldn't walk fast as there were so many dead bodies on the road.

The fifth testimony is that of Khadra Muhumed Abdi, who spoke to Africa Watch in London on June 2, 1989:

On the Friday, I came to our hotel (Oriental Hotel), unaware at the time, of the SNM attack on Burao. I learned that businessmen and elders were being rounded up. As a former political prisoner, I was nervous. NSS officers came to look for me. I escaped through a back door and hid in a store next door. Later, I asked a young boy to fetch me a taxi and I went to hide in my aunt's house in Dumbuluq district. I was afraid to go home for fear that they would be waiting for me.

The morning after the SNM attack on Hargeisa, I could see our district, Radio Station area, burning. It seemed as if the whole city was on fire. The government was going around with loudspeakers saying that "Four lice-ridden bandits on a suicide mission entered the town and we have now driven them away." They insisted that everything was back to normal and urged people to return to their homes. Unfortunately, many people believed them and were killed.

It was clear that the war was going on whatever the government said. I could not run because of the disability in my leg. [She limps in one leg.] My mother and my two children joined us on the third day of the fighting. A part of our house had collapsed and they tried to hide in the undamaged section. They

left when it was no longer safe to stay there. A neighbor gave them shelter but the children had no milk and food was scarce.

We stayed another twelve days in my aunt's house. Soldiers came and took everything we had. What they couldn't take with them, such as trunks, they destroyed. When he sensed our tension, one of them turned around and said to me, "If I hear one word out of you, I will make you carry the heads of your children after I have cut them off." Fortunately, I made the two boys (one was a year and three months and the other was two years and three months) wear dresses, so they thought they were girls. If they had recognized them as boys they would have shot them at once. We knew of so many boys, including babies, who had been killed. A neighbor of my aunt's, known as "Cirro," had five sons and two nephews in the house. Because of their ages, he wouldn't let them out of the house. When they ran out of food, he went to buy it himself. When he came back, all seven boys were dead, their throats slit. In that same neighborhood, in a house belonging to Abdillahi Ibrahim Aden, soldiers heard them listening to the BBD. They killed four boys with bazookas.

The shelling wouldn't cease, so we hid in another house. We tried to escape between the compounds of the 24th and the 11<sup>th</sup> sector of the army. We went to the dry-river bed, about 100 of us, but were driven away by soldiers. Then we tried to escape through a place called Meegaga but turned back when we saw soldiers again. Everyone then just fled, escaping in whatever way they could. I couldn't walk fast, let alone run, because of my foot. One of my cousins and I got lost. We hid in a hut and were found by another cousin who had come to look



for us. I couldn't go on. My leg hurt too much. My cousins found a donkey cart for me. We reached Qool'A day after three days. We found thousands of other people there. I had no idea what had happened to my children and mother.

The final testimony is that of Abdi Mohamed, who Robert Hitchcock interviewed in London in July 1990. Mr. Mohamed had gone to visit relatives in the countryside southeast of Burao in Togheer Region. His relatives, who were nomads, had been attacked from the air, their camp bombed and strafed by Somali government planes. They had also found their main water points poisoned, and most of their camels had died from thirst. His testimony indicates the degree to which pastoral nomads were victimized by the Somali government.

Several months before the army attacked Burao [May 27, 1988], I went to see my children who had been staying in the area outside Ainabo. Two of my sons had been arrested by soldiers and accused of being members of the Somali National Movement. The soldiers said that they and other nomads were giving food to the SNM. They beat them very badly in prison but my sons told the soldiers nothing. When they got out they sent word to me in Burao to join them. As I traveled there, I saw many *barkad* [water reservoirs] that had been blown up by the army. One of the soldiers on the truck said that the army destroyed the reservoirs to punish the Isaaks for helping the SNM. They also killed the camels and cattle of people so that they had to move in to the cities to get food. Land mines were placed around the *barkad* to keep people away.

When I got to my sons' camp I found that some of my relatives had been killed. They were shot by the army after some soldiers were hurt by a mine on one of the roads. At night I could hear explosions and gunshots. In the morning we would sometimes find the bodies of people and livestock in camps that had been destroyed by the soldiers. Some of the bodies were burned. I will never forget the smell.

There were so many people killed, nearly all of them Isaaks. The government in Mogadishu wanted to destroy the Isaaks ever since 1982 when a state of emergency was declared.

### **Account 3: The Tyua of Western Zimbabwe**

The Tyua San (Amasili, Bushmen) of western Zimbabwe and northeastern Botswana are an agropastoral and fishing people who are former foragers (Hitchcock, 1995). Numbering approximately 2,500 in the Tsholotsho and Bulalima Mangwe Districts in western Zimbabwe and 7,000 in northern Botswana, the Tyua were affected by dispossession as a result of land being set aside for white settlers, the establishment of national parks and game reserves, the imposition of hunting laws that prevented them from obtaining wildlife legally, and forced resettlement into "protected villages" during the Zimbabwean War of Independence (1965-1980). Today, many Tyua work on the farms and ranches of other people, including Tswana, Kalanga, and Ndebele and they sell handicrafts, meat, salt, and beer to earn extra income.

In the early 1980's after Zimbabwe achieved its independence, tensions continued to be felt, particularly in Matabeleland, where one of the major groups of freedom fighters, the Zimbabwe African Peoples Liberation Army, the military wing of the Zimbabwe African Peoples Union (ZAPU), had its primary base of support. Some of the former guerrillas felt that they had not been treated appropriately by the new government, and tensions erupted into conflict in late 1980 and early 1981. Some of the former guerrillas returned to the bush and began what turned into a low-level insurgency. Beginning in 1982 and continuing into the mid-1980s, the Zimbabwe government carried out counterinsurgency operations against what they termed "dissidents." These operations included military attacks on villagers in western Zimbabwe, kidnappings of suspected terrorists, torture and murder of detainees, a wide range of atrocities against the civilian population, and restriction of the movement of food into the area (Africa Watch, 1989; Catholic Justice and Peace Commission and Legal Rights Foundation, 1997).

The man who described some of these and other events occurring in the 1982-1985 period was an elderly Tyua who had been imprisoned during the Zimbabwe war for independence. Subsequently, he was detained by the new government on suspicion of having supported the dissidents. The interview was conducted by Robert Hitchcock in Tsholotsho, Zimbabwe, on June 26, 1989. The man requested that his name not be used.

I was living in western Tsholotsho just south of Hwange.<sup>7</sup> I used to live in the game reserve but we were forced to leave by the whites. My father hunted elephants there but he was arrested and put in prison. I helped my mother and brothers and sisters by collecting salt at Sua. But then the war came<sup>8</sup> and the

Selous Scouts<sup>9</sup> came to our village and beat us up. My brother was shot as we watched. They kept saying, "You are Bushmen. You should not support the black people."<sup>10</sup> I was glad when Smith<sup>11</sup> lost the war and we got a new government. I voted in the elections. I thought that everything would be good with a new government. The Bushmen would be treated like other people, not flogged with sticks like we were by the white farmers.

Then the killings began. At first it was white people, part of Smith's army, who came to Tsholotsho and shot people. I saw my best friend taken away by the soldiers in a truck. I never saw him again. Many people were taken away. The soldiers came at night. Sometimes they shot people in their beds. They were after Ndebele and Bushmen. They called us dissidents. But we were just people trying to make a living.

At that time the drought was very bad. There were no crops in the fields, and the wild fruits were very few. Even elands<sup>12</sup> were dying in the bush. Then the government said we could not get food. They stopped the trucks from coming to the stores. We were very hungry, and children and old people died of starvation. People even ate their skin blankets and shoes.

It was then that the soldiers in red hats<sup>13</sup> came to my village. They said that we should send women to help them carry water. Later we learned that the women had been raped. Two of the women from our village were shot by the soldiers. The army people would come to Tsholotsho and say that we were dissidents. They pointed to people and they were taken away. Later we heard they had been killed and their bodies dumped into old mines. There were many

places where the bodies were left. We would sometimes find them when we were looking for lost cattle.

My close friend Khunou was arrested by the soldiers. They said he had robbed stores and stolen cattle. I told them that he was innocent, but they said, “He is just a Bushman. Bushmen are animals.” That night they shot him. His wife and children fled to Botswana after the soldiers burned their houses and killed their chickens.

I was arrested by the soldiers in red hats and taken to an army base. They did not give us food or water. They tortured me by putting my head in water and hitting me on the backside. They kept calling me a “dumb Bushman.” Some of the people in the camp with me died from the beatings.

Many innocent people died because of the army. We were just trying to make a living like we always have. But they felt we were just Bushmen. I wondered then why I voted for this government.

## NOTES

1. Chittagong Hill Tracts Commission (1991). *“Life Is Not Ours”: Land and Human Rights in the Chittagong Hill Tracts, Bangladesh: The Report of the Chittagong Hill Tracts Commission, May 1991*. Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs and Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Organizing

Committee, Chittagong Hill Tracts Campaign. The first testimony is on p. 97, the second on p. 99.

2. The Somali National Movement, an opposition organization composed mainly of Isaaks, one of several Somali clans that was formed to fight the government forces of President Siad Barre in northern Somalia.
3. The Gulwadayaal, also known as Victory Pioneers, were paramilitary forces, established in the early 1970's, who worked directly for President Siad Barre. They had extraordinary legal authority over and above the Somali police and could charge people with crimes and make arrests.
3. National Security Service, the national security organization of the government of the Somali Democratic Republic.
4. Hwange, formerly Wankie National Park, the largest national park in Zimbabwe.
5. The Zimbabwe war for independence, which lasted from 1965 to 1980. The time period that he is referring to is the mid-to late 1970's.
6. Elite troops of the Rhodesian military.

7. The black people they were referring to belonged to the Zimbabwe African National Union, ZANU, which was made up of Ndebele, Kalanga, Tonga, and other groups and was headed by Joshua Nkomo.
  8. Ian Smith, the then Prime Minister of Rhodesia.
  9. *Taurotragus oryx*, large antelopes that move in herds up to about 50 animals each and which are highly prized by Tyua and other San (Bushmen) for food because of their high fat content.
  10. The members of the Fifth Brigade, a North Korea-trained military unit that was under the Prime Minister's office rather than the regular Zimbabwe Army. It was this brigade that was said to have been responsible for the killings of as many as 20,000 people in western Zimbabwe in 1982-1983.
-